DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 149 263 CG 012 301

AUTHOR Babladelis, Georgia
TITLE The Psychology of Women.
PUB DATE 3 May 77
NOTE 22p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavioral Science Research; *Behavior Patterns; *Females; Individual Psychology; *Psychological Studies; *Psychology; Research Needs; Research Reviews (Publications); *Sex Differences; Sex Stereotypes; State of the Art Reviews; Working Women

ABSTRACT

This paper reviews the history of Division 35 (Division of Psychology of Women) of the American Psychological Association. It discusses the meaning of the concept of a psychology of women, starting with Parlee's distress that such a concept conveys a need for a special or separate set of laws or theories about women and concludes with Mednick's defense of the concept on pragmatic and heuristic grounds. A case is made for the need of such a concept because of psychology's past preoccupation with males as subjects. The establishment of norms and criteria for behavior on such limited samples fosters a tendency to make unfair and derogatory applications to and interpretations of female behaviors. Sex-difference research is viewed as an inadequate solution because, among other reasons, it perpetuates rather than alleviates the problem by use of male-established norms to interpret the "differences." A brief review of some publications on the psychology of women emphasizes the interest and activity in this area. Recent research foci are analyzed and future research needs are discussed, e.g., areas such as problem-solving strategies (cognitive styles) and the middle years. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED149263

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF WOMEN

Invited Address, University of Hawaii, Department of Psychology, Honolulu, Hawaii, May 3, 1977

Georgia Babladelis

California State University, Hayward

It is a pleasure and an honor to be here with you today.

One of the reasons I was invited here is because I am the editor of the new journal: Psychology of Women Quarterly. The Quarterly is the official journal of Division 35 of the American Psychological Association, which is the Division of the Psychology of Women. It seemed to me appropriate that I talk today about this new area of growing interest and activity.

First I would like to tell you a little of the history of the division and its journal, then discuss with you the meaning of the concept of a psychology of women. After that, we'll look at what has happened in this area of inquiry and what some of the new developments are.

History

Although interest in the psychology of women was characteristic of varied groups for a long time, it was in 1973 at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association that these interest groups coalesced into a formal, legitimate division of APA. Pro-tem officers were elected and began the work of refining a structure and governance for the division to accomplish its tasks. Among the priority items to consider was the establishment of a journal. All of us -- officers and members of the division -- favored the publication of a journal for a number of reasons:

1) to provide an outlet for research and theory about the behavior of women

2) to emphasize the psychological study of women

3) to provide a resource of significant, reliable thought and information for persons in various decision making positions (e.g., administrators, counselors, personnel managers, governmental and private industry policy makers)

4) to provide reliable, significant data for educators and students

5) to provide a stimulus to future research and theory for scholars and

6) to aid in bringing about a non-sexist science of behavior.

CG012301

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Babladelis, G.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

It goes without saying that the accomplishment of any major achievement reflects the work of many dedicated and able persons. Equally obvious is the fact that the Division of the Psychology of Women had a long agenda of concerns for attention and action. The journal, therefore, was only one aspect of our undertaking, but because it is of central importance, it serves as an example of the efforts of Division 35. Also, since that is the area of work in which I have been chiefly involved, I know alot more about it. I'll give you a capsule history of its development under each president of the division so that you can get some notion of the pace of accomplishments of this division and the caliber of its leadership.

The first president of Division 35 was Elizabeth Douvan, Professor of Psychology at the University of Michigan. She appointed me to chair a committee to investigate publication of a journal. By the end of her term we had determined the feasibility and desirability of such a publication.

Our second president was Helen S. Astin, Professor of Education at UCLA and vice-president of the Institute of Higher Education. During her term we determined the nature and scope of the journal and concluded contract arrangements with a publisher. The division membership elected me editor of the new journal, so my responsibilities changed from chairing a committee to bring a journal into being, to becoming its first editor.

Our third president was Florence Denmark, Professor of Psychology and Director of the Graduate Psychology Program at CUNY. During her term we completed the editorial structure of the journal and prepared for an undertook the work which follows placing a notice in the APA Monitor announcing the new journal to the scientific community and requesting the submission of manuscripts to the editor.

In the Fall, 1976 at the annual convention of APA in Washington, D.C., the first issue of Psychology of Women Quarterly made its debut and our fourth president took office: Martha Mednick, Professor of Psychology and Director of Women's Studies, University of Connecticut. Professor Mednick also undertook to be the journal's first book review editor. During her term we enlarged our plans for special topics to be studied and implemented some of them. During Professor Mednick's term as president of Division 35, all of volume 1 of the Quarterly will have been published, including one issue, the third, devoted to an examination of achievement motivation in women.

When Annette Brodsky, Professor of Psychology at the University of Alabama, takes office as the fifth president of Division 35 this fall, the first issue of volume 2 of the Quarterly will be available to readers, and plans for a special issue of the hournal dealing with Androgyny research will be well along -- a special issue she has helped bring about.

This very brief account of the development of one aspect of our work -- that is, the journal, -- omits details and glosses over problems, but it conveys to you the vitality of the division and the eminence of its leadership. It is a way of saying: Clearly, there is an area of psychological study concerning women that is long overdue for serious, systematic attention from psychologists, and now some of the best minds in psychology are attending to it!

What is Psychology of Women

Possibly many of you have questioned the idea of psychology of women as distinct from psychology in general. And those of you who didn't think about it at all may be entertaining the question now. A response to that question can be made in broad terms first, then more specifically in terms of the controversy about the concept and those who have tried to define it.

Broadly then, the history of psychology itself is one of periodic and cyclical attention to particular concerns, whether process or content areas. One has only to read the tables of contents of our journals and the Annual Review of Psychology to note the particularization of areas receiving research and/or theoretical attention. For example, psychology -- which is the study of behavior (covert or overt) -- has preoccupied itself with individual differences, small group interactions, intra-psychic problems, dyadic behavior, the brain, the behavior of certain species --the rat, for example --there is a whole psychology of the rat -- sometimes enlarging sometimes narrowing the problem considered; sometimes dealing with behavior, real or imagined, in infancy or old age, in childhood or adulthood. Our professional organization, the APA, reflects that same particularization in its many divisions, primarily as a way of focussing research attention to particular problems and coming to grips with them. We have, for example, divisions of child psychology, developmental, general psychology, teaching psychology, the military, personality, social psychology and population -- to name but a few of the current 37 divisions in APA.

Definition of Concept

Mary Brown Parlee has argued that the concept of a psychology of women is misguided -- she called it a "conceptual monstrosity" -- because it implies that we need a special set of laws and theories to account for the behavior of women. Her argument is that if women were included in current psychological studies of motives, attitudes, social and cognitive process, etc., we would achieve a focus on some of the most interesting work being done in psychology. (Therein lies the rub, of course). She seems to accept Nancy Henley's distinctions that there can be discerned a psychology for women, a psychology against women, but

that a psychology of women is conceptually chaotic and in some cases methodologically unsound; she concludes that a concept such as psychology and women would provide a better rubric under which explorations can be undertaken to redress the errors of the past.

You will have to read Parlee's and Henley's arguments for the full impact and development of their points, but briefly it goes like this:

Psychology against women: psychological studies of women are biased in obvious ways: selection of subjects and measures, inappropriate presentation and generalization of findings, misrepresentation of results of others' work, and bias in the initial formulation of problems. I agree that psychology has been used against women in those ways and I will talk more about that later.

Psychology for women: this involves 1) presenting or discovering new phenomena (e.g., women are prejudiced against women; stereotyped views of what is mentally healthy); 2) reinterpretation of traditional notions (e.g., Horner's work on achievement motivation has led to a reexamination of McClelland's work -- and now to hers too): 3) showing the relevance of traditional theories for understanding new phenomena (e.g., social learning theory as used by Tennov to explain the learning of sex-typed behaviors; or attribution theory as used by Deux or by Frieze, to understand how men and women explain success or failure; or views about uses of non-verbal communication or uses of social space to understand power relationships among people). One can add to this list, too, the use of language to express sexism (Blaubergs).

Martha Mednick has presented an effective and concise counterargument to Parlee's criticism of the concept of psychology of women -- a concept which Parlee saw as misguided. Mednick argued for the usefulness of the concept as an "integrative and catalytic rubric."

With reference to work by Weisstein, Kieffer, Helson and others who document the use of psychology as a powerful weapon for keeping women in their place, Mednick agrees that psychology has been used against women, pervasively, effectively, and destructively. Her final example of such attitudes was to cite the work of a male psychologist (E.C. Lewis) who presumably presents evidence in his book that women who make career choices are poorly adjusted compared to those who choose to become housewives. (I'll be telling you of some data to the contrary later). Mednick quotes the following from Lewis's preface "... I believe I have an advantage, as a man, in writing about women. Most books and articles about women have been written by women, and many have been justifiably criticized for being too emotional and biased. It is difficult, and perhaps impossible, for a female writer to be objective in discussing women's roles. In many cases, their views and arguments are in support of their own role, and perhaps are an attempt to justify it. The result may be interesting but not objective. In any case ... I wish to emphasize ... that my being a man should be of secondary concern. I am writing as a psychologist and I hope my views will be judged on that basis."

Looking at psychology for women, Mednick finds Parlee's summary of new directions representative of the concerns that require research attention. She adds that we should study "the social-psychological parameters of institutionalized sexism" and refers to examples of such research from Jessie Bernard's work on the "put down" and the "stag effect" and from Judith Long Laws' analysis of the social psychology of tokenism.

She argues that the rubric, psychology and women, is overly general and connotes concerns of women as psychologists, that is, with professional and status aspects. Everyone involved in these discussions agrees that sex-difference research is not a useful approach to the understanding of women's behavior, for reasons we shall discuss. Pointing out that psychology is a multifaceted discipline and that psychologists do research on varied special interests, applied or basic, Mednick concludes that "psychologists doing research on women represent almost the entire gamut of ... psychology." She is convinced that by allowing variations in professional orientations and styles and intent we can best develop a comprehensive body of knowledge about women -- a body of knowledge that can be utilized to understand and change persons and institutions. The very need for such diversity of interests and approaches to an understanding of female behavior is a compelling enough reason to have a field defined in such a way that it can be attractive to all psychologists sharing an interest in studying female behavior. She suggests that in people's minds there is an area of study called the psychology of women, and that it has served as an effective unbrella and catalyst for creative work stemming from the many backgrounds and orientations that comprise psychology.

Need for the concept

A more particular response to the question of why do we need a psychology of women; is the generally acknowledged of human behavior is based on studies of male college students (of course, we all know how convenient it is to use college students as subjects in the academic pressure of publish or perish, but do they have to be males? and should convenience dictate the dimensions of knowledge we hope to achieve?) Perhaps it is accurate to say there has been a knowledge explosion -- or at least a proliferation of information -- in psychology, but it has been about a very limited segment of humanity. That is not to say that some hardy and far-thinking individuals have not studied other sorts of people, e.g., infants, -- and a few are now studying the old, or the aging process; fewer still are studying regular adults -- you know, all of us middle-aged types --those longest years of life and what we do with them -- the mature years, if you will -- depending on one's verbal dispositions, or the age of the investigator! However, I am referring here to the omission of, or infrequent attention to, large segments of the human population from a psychological understanding of human behavior: Women. I'm not even dealing with the problem of individual differences in general -- one that has plagued

psychology in all its facets, except to remind you of the astute review by Rae Carlson when she raised the question: where is the person in personality?

If it is disconcerting to some to note that we have a tough time coping with individual variations within an intensely studied area and with a small segment of humanity, it should be at least worrisome to note we know little or nothing about a large segment of people, indeed, the majority of the population--and that is WOMEN.

One example of the detrimental effects of lack of information about women -- in fact, misapplication of information determined by studying males -- is in the area of psychotherapy. Clinical psychologists have a profound committment to the understanding of human behavior in that such understanding holds promise for clinical applications. Though the application in each case is to an individual, the practical formulations are derived from theoretical and empirical developments in our understanding of human behavior. If our general behavioral laws are faulty, that is, are found to be based on a small, non-representational sample of persons, then applications to individuals will misfire. They will misfire sometimes anyway even when the individuals treated are members of the group on whom theoretical knowledge is based, simply because we lack complete understanding of important variables such as genetic predispositions or social forces. But they will misfire often, if not always, when the "treatment" group or person is a member of a different sample in the population from which the studied sample was drawn. We have seen that occur already in the history of clinical psychology when such things as verbal treatment methods, derived from intra-psychic models of personality, based on studies of a certain class of persons, did not "work" for persons not in that class, e.g., lower class persons. Such impediments to clinical work led to research: cross-cultural, inter-class, developmental, and other, so that variables related to interpersonal experiences and mediated by variables related to age, cultural or ethnic group influenced the development of other theoretical models. Those variables, frequently referred to as socialization processes -- or how and what people learn -- became important to understanding human behavior. A good example of that revolution in theory is the development of social learning theory and the implications for treatment that it holds. If we agree that what you learn has some effect on what you can do or see to do, then it stands to reason that socialization based on discriminable properties, such as sex, will affect what a person does, can do, aspires to, and all other behaviors we can think of. Indeed, the development of social learning theory as a conceptual approach to the understanding of behavior augurs well for a better understanding of women in that it departs dramatically from an intra-psychic model of male development and constrains us to the consideration of interpersonal interactions. Deutsch, Horney, Thompson and other women psychoanalysts criticized psychoanalytic theory for its failure to depict accurately the development of females and, instead, to construe females along dimensions derived from the study of a limited sample of males. So flattering

to the male ego and so demeaning to the female is the psychoanalytic view that one wonders why a "logical" male analyst has not contributed an essay to the annuals of psychoanalysis raising the question of "can women be trusted to raise (male) children?" -- an essay on par with Freud's on analysis: terminable or interminable.

Discontent with the inadequacies of psychoanalytic theory as a view of human development fostered and strengthened the development of social learning theory. But that is not all of the story, for the story still lacks a happy ending. Continued discontent with the development of behavioral laws based on studies of male subjects has led to theoretical explanations of so called sex differences to the detriment of females. In short, although we can agree that learning and reinforcement is important -- indeed, that understanding the socialization process is essential -- to our understanding of people, we do not extend that theory to understanding women. Instead we construe them only in relationship to men. Some changes are discernible though. Examination of sex-related behaviors in such things as competencies or aspirations are being explored in terms of reinforcement contingencies (Mischel; Tennov). It is one sort of contribution to discover that males and females differ in mathematical ability, but it is another sort of contribution to examine the influence of differential reinforcement in bringing about that difference. The latter contribution allows us "choice" in what should or could be taught and permits remedial action if desired. Why, it has even been demonstrated (Tobias) that women can be taught math skills!

Sex-difference research

A rejoinder may be that of course we know about women -- after all, sex differences are noted in research findings. Not only is that not the general case, but it is an irrelevancy even if it were true. Sex differences often are not noted either because they are not measured to begin with (that is, only one sex is used as subjects), or when noted, are relegated to a footnote indicating dismissal or treatment of the difference as "noise" in the system. (It seems that many researchers simply cannot cope with sex differences if the different behavior noted departs from the general hypothesis presented when writing up their discussion sections). (see Denmark; Carlson; others).

When sex differences are reported and discussed -- and this is why I said that sex-difference research alone is irrelevant or inadequate to the task of understanding female behavior -- findings about women subjects are interpreted in a context where male behavior is the "norm" or criterion for competency. Thus, the usual outcome is that those "different" behaviors found for women are treated as deviant at best and sometimes are spoken of as actual deficiencies in the female's performance. Moreover, as Maccoby and Jacklin have documented, even those sex-differences treated heretofore as "sacred cows" in the research literature and passed on from one generation of students to the next via introductory textbooks

or special texts on individual differences, -- are found to be lacking in reliability and validity, are based on studies fraught with methodological problems, and should be viewed now as the ghosts of the past rather than the skeleton on which to build a substantive body of knowledge about women. Girls may or may not be superior in verbal acquisition and boys may or may not be superior in spatial concepts -- the evidence is unclear and not persuasive. But it isn't that there is anything wrong with finding sex differences, or indeed, that such findings may not be most enlightening -- it is that the criteria used for assessing their existence are based on stereotypical masculine behaviors, thus predetermining the outcome. That there are important sex differences is a position held by Bardwick and Carlson and others, but they argue that we must discover the particular female competencies if indeed they are different, and employ them particularly -- one might even add, where traditionally attributed male competencies have not been adequate to problem solving. To know about the psychology of women is to know more than just how women differ from men, with male behaviors as the criteria of competencies.

What has happened?

In the past several years there has been a significant increase in books about women in all fields (history, literature, politics, psychology). Books dealing with the psychology of women are particularly notable for in the 70's we have seen the publication of more books on this topic than characterized the preceding couple of decades. That is not to say that important work was not published earlier (e.g. Thompson, Deutsch, Horney), but only that they were relatively few and, as has been pointed out, largely ignored for their contribution to the psychology of women per se. In the 70's we have seen the publication of Bardwick's The Psychology of Women, of Sherman's On the Psychology of Women, Astin and colleagues A Bibliography of Sex Role Research, Baer & Sherif, A Topical Bibliography on the Psychology of Women, Bernard's Future of Marriage and Future of Motherhood, Chesler's Women and Madness, Tennov's Psychotherapy: the hazardous cure, Huber's Changing Women in a Changing Society, Maccoby and Jacklin's The Psychology of Sex Differences, Unger and Denmark's Women: Dependent or Independent Variable, Mednick, Tangri, and Hoffman's Women and Achievement -- and so many more! And I haven't listed all the books that are on my bookshelves alone. Judging from publishers' announcements and requests to review manuscripts, there will be even more books published on the psychology of women in the next several years.

The contents of these books vary, as perhaps you can tell from some of the titles. Many topics are covered, such as achievement motivation, androgyny research, or psychotherapy; some are critical reviews of research, or psychotherapy; some are critical reviews of research, such as the review of sex-difference research; some are collections of articles sampling several areas, and providing the basis for discussion in intro-

ductory courses; some are more commonly described as textbooks, attempting to present the history and development of the psychology of women.

Research activity parallels the burgeoning interest in the psychology of women. Articles touching on one aspect or another (e.g., cognition, problem solving, sex-role socialization) are appearing in nearly all major journals. One has only to look at the Annual Review of Psychology index to trace the increase of research activity in all areas dealing with women. In 1959, the first year of publication of the Annual Review of Psychology, there were several references to sex-differences and a few to sex roles. After that there were only 1 - 3 per year dealing with aspects of sex-roles (except in 1963 and 1964 there were none) and usually 1-3 on sex differences (except in 1961 and 1962 there were a few more but in 1963 and 1964 there were none.) It looks as though 1963 and 1964 were a "bust" for interest in psychological studies even referring to the word sex, let alone women -- except for some studies on the sexual behavior of other animals. But in 1973 Division 35 was established as a new division of the APA and in 1975 the Annual Review of Psychology accorded recognition to this new area by including a chapter on the psychology of women (Mednick and Weissman). Since then there has been a noticeable leap in research references to women, or sex-role development, or related topics. For example, in 1976 there were references to 7 specific areas of sex difference findings and 5 references to sex-roles. These references cross-cut traditional areas of concern and appeared in studies in chapters on cognition, learning, as well as developmental, personality, and social psychology. In 1977 sex difference references remained about the same, but sex-role references jumped to a dozen. Although the word "woman" did not appear for the first time in 1975, it did appear as a concept and as a title and as a recognized legitimate area of research for psychologists as the psychology of women in 1975 for the first time.

I said that the word "women" had appeared before in the indices of the Annual Reviews, so let me digress a moment to elaborate that. In 1959 under "women" there were two references: one dealt with mechanical aptitudes -- or the lack of them -- in women; and the other referred to a study of career oriented vs homemaking oriented women. That looked like a promising beginning, so I looked up the reference and found it had been cited only as contributing to the validity of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. It's rather interesting; let me quote some of it: "...the homemaking-oriented girls averaged significantly higher than the career-oriented girls (by the way, the subjects had been college women) on the Strong scales for buyer, housewife, ...secretary,... and dietician, and significantly lower on scales for artist, author, ... psychologist, ... and physician. On the Edwards scale, the homemaking group scored higher on heterosexuality and succorance and lower on achievement, ... and endurance. The authors proposed that the differences in interest scores reflect differences in basic (my emphasis) needs or motivation." (p. 350).

So much for the fine beginning! Women did not appear in the subject index again until 1963, when the attitudes of middleclass women were surveyed. Between 1963 and 1972 there were no references to women, although I did find references to worms, wolves, and whales. In 1972 there was one reference to women's liberation; in 1973 there was 1 reference to women in counseling. In 1974 there were no references to women. In 1975 a whole chapter was devoted to the psychology of women. In 1976 there were 8 references to women in the index, and in 1977 there were 12. The concept "women" was in the research literature at last, and 1975 did mark an important turning point for psychologists by calling attention to a research area which had an impressive literature as well as official status as a division of the APA; it began to stimulate new and continuing research.

Additionally, new journals have emerged to accomodate and disseminate the growing work being done in the psychology of women. The Psychology of Women Quarterly (1976), Sex-Roles, and Signs (1975). Traditional journals have published special issues dealing with topics in the psychology of women, for example, there have been two such issues published by the Journal of Social Issues (1972 & 1976), Psychotherapy Theory and Research (1976), International Journal of Group Tensions, Criminal Behavior, Journal of Marriage and the Family, Counseling, and others. But what are the new Journals?

Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society is not a psychological journal, but psychologists publish in it. It is devoted mainly to history, literature, politics, the arts, etc.

Sex - Roles: A Journal of Research is chiefly a psychological journal, but retains an interdisciplinary influence in its editorial makeup and contributions. It is devoted to research on sex-roles, their development, and their effects, and other explorations.

Psychology of Women Quarterly is the official journal of Division 35. To quote from an ad put out by our publisher, Human Sciences Press, in which I had a hand in writing: "This new quarterly will publish ... current and important findings now occuring in the area of female psychology. Among the subjects to be covered, as they apply to women, are personality development, ... socialization, psychobiology, female sexuality, ... psychopathology, psychotherapy, child development and child rearing, creativity, career development, and leadership training. The journal will distinguish itself from other publications about women by virtue of its specifically psychological focus, the nature of its empirical research, and the quality of its theoretical presentations."

I believe the brief summary of books, articles, and journals appearing in the 70's is an adequate general view -- perhaps even a sufficient one -- of the robust activity in the psychological study of women. Let me turn now to a view of productivity as reflected in the Psychology of Women Quarterly.

To date I have received approximately 300 manuscripts. Most of them are reports of empirical research and a small proportion -- about 10% -- are theoretical papers or critical reviews. All areas of concern are represented. Research topics include sex-role development, influence of role models on career choices, implications of androgyny, the treatment of women in psychotherapy, influences of physiological factors -- to name but a few research areas. Basic investigations of developmental variables, influence of the interpersonal milieau, problem-solving strategies with relevant problem and solution criteria -- are sparse yet. In general there is a paucity of information about minority women. In this journal we attempt, also, to keep up with media treatment of women by including film and tape reviews as well as book reviews. You can guess from the view I gave you of the publication pace that keeping up with new books in the field is a prodigious task.

In a talk to the New York Academy of Science, Mednick discerned three main areas of research activity: 1) work stimulated by concern with feminist issues; 2) work concerned with information gathering in a variety of areas; 3) and what she considered a blatantly opportunistic approach -- a class of work characterized by seeing if everything we've ever found out applies to women too. She considers the first area of concern the most significant. It is the questions raised by feminist critiques that have given rise to substantive research attempting to identify and clarify women's behavior, e.g., achievement motivation (previously treated as a footnote about sex differences by McClelland), or competencies (since these are usually defined in masculine terms, women end by having none by contrast), or characteristics of women who pursue carrers and/or are creative (the usual assertion is that such women are and always have been neurotic). Many of the neglected areas of research are bing addressed and the contents of the Quarterly represent significant progress in those areas. At a research conference soon to be published in a volume edited by Sherman and Denmark, "it was noted repeatedly that there is an absence of research attention to: achievement, sex-roles, female sexuality, reproductive cycle, power, creativity, and group behavior." (Mednick). Reesa Vaughter's systematic review of the literature confirmed that impression. A review of the contents of the Quarterly shows impressive gains in meeting those research needs.

It looks like the research that has been noted as needing doing is beginning to get done and that its publication not only will provide much needed information about women, but also stimulate new inquiries. Even though the Quarterly is in itself a special journal concerned with the psychology of women, we plan to devote parts or all of some issues to specific topics so that they may be examined in more detail and so that areas of need can be brought into focus. We are planning a special issue on the dual-career couple, on women in therapy, on black women, on androgyny research, and on working women.

The Quarterly plays an important pivotal role in stimulating research and directing attention to areas requiring research. A journal reflects

the preoccupation of researchers, yet editorial selection of work gives emphases to certain areas and draws researchers' attention to new ideas. In a sense, the editorial composition of a research journal affects the domain of knowledge in an area and stimulates ideas that will extend that domain (an observation one might keep in mind when examining the editorial boards of most journals).

Examples of Research

Having reviewed for you the evidence of research activity, let me give you some brief examples of important areas requiring study and currently being studied.

One consequence of making men the measure of all things has been to view women as deficient. Such a view has had implications for the education of women, for their career aspirations and attainments. We are all familiar with statistics showing lower educational access for women, few or absent rewards for educational and career attainment, and barriers or punishments for crossing occupational and educational barriers. O'Leary, in her review of occupational barriers to women, reported numerous studies which demonstrated the ways in which women not only are prevented from attaining managerial positions but also the derogatory attributions made of her when she crosses those barriers. Since successful behaviors in management or other leadership roles are typically defined in masculine terms, women who are in such positions are over a barrell since in order to behave as is expected they run the risk of being called "masculine" -- among other things, or, if they do not, then they are seen as unfit or not suitable for the job. In laboratory studies, women will emerge or be perceived as leaders in all-female groups, but in mixed-sex groups, men become the leaders despite independent assessments of abilities of the participants. Male supervisees tend to regard women supervisors negatively and women workers themselves prefer male supervisors to women and hold negative or derogatory attitudes toward female bosses. Recent research shows that if managers and supervisees are happy with the outcome of their collaboration, more "effort" is attributed to managers by supervisees of the other sex, even though independent measures of effort show managers of both sexes to have exerted equal effort. It's as though if something works out okay, then it has to be because the boss-lady tried harder! Perhaps that can be viewed as an improvement over not attributing any success to her at all. Women who achieve in education or in business are frequently described in perjorative terms, not only for their on-going behavior but in explaining how they achieved in the first place. For example, it is frequently said of such women that as youngsters they were misfits, unpopular, rejected, or some combination of things leading her to rebel against those in her social mileau. In other words, that she strove to achieve because she was a misfit in all other ways. Numerous studies show this is not the case. Recently Stake and Levitz found that achieving women are in accord with significant others -- that is to say that the

important people in her life like parents and friends provided reinforcement for achievement. Incidentally, they found too that women who had working mothers who worked because they wanted to, also received encouragement to aspire to greater goals.

The importance of role models is not unknown in psychological literature, but extending those studies has shown us that the effects of sex-role modeling on the occupational interests of youngsters is significant. Much has been written about the absence of role models for women in the professions and in business and it has been noted that the lack of female models makes it difficult for developing women to make life choices. Sandberg and White recently investigated model effects on youngsters and found that same-sexed models had a significant effect on career preferences of children; so attention to roles assigned to women in real life and on TV is important. There seems to be little doubt based on emerging data from studies conceptually derived from social learning principles that women, too, are influenced by reinforcement contingencies and role models and that the findings of differences in aspiration or achievement do not reflect intrinsic motivational differences.

Women in therapy pose a serious dilemma to therapists. On the one hand, the therapist is committed to helping the client know and attain her potential; on the other hand, women who seek anything other than the traditional roles ascribed to them are considered, by definition, abnormal. So, to make her normal, the therapist must help her be content with her "place." The wrok of Broverman and her colleagues, and of Gump, and others reveals that typical feminine characteristics are equated with typical neurotic characteristics and what is considered normal or good happens, also, to be those characteristics considered masculine. It's a knotty problem. The "proper" female is not mentally healthy to begin with, according to the adjectives used to describe her, but she's downright sick if she seeks to become normal! More dramatic statements and examples of that dilemma can be found in chesler's Women and Madness and Tennov's Psychotherapy: the hazardous cure.

In a recent issue of the American Psychologist, Stricker claimed that the case just described of women in therapy was exaggerated, despite the findings of a special Task Force of the Commission on the Status of Women. He does agree with the Task Force's condemnation of male therapists sexual use of female clients, that is, he agrees that it is a bad thing to do and should be stopped. In addition to a general methodological critique, he makes two points in support of his contention that the findings of bias against women in therapy are questionable: 1) therapists, he claims, treat persons as individuals, not as a class, so to talk about how women are treated in therapy is misleading if not erroneous. Well, I'm sure lots of therapists do treat persons as individuals -- especially if they are trained to do so in the first place (an assumption we should examine), but their training for how to treat the individual is, after all, derived from what they have learned about what governs human behavior and

what is considered to be "normal." If, as we have argued, that information is narrowly derived, then it cannot, with any hope of success or fairness, be widely applied. 2) His second point against the contention of discriminatory therapeutic practices is to reveal data that women therapists are just as discriminatory as male therapists. In my mind, he missed the point of the Task Force findings. Of course, many women therapists have been trained the same as men therapists and would have been taught the same prejudices. They probably worked doubly hard to attain them -- many studies show that if a woman makes it in a man's world she frequently does so by taking on the valued, salient male characteristics. No doubt women are harder on other women than men are. Men who assume they are superior can afford to indulge women's foibles, but the striving woman must never show herself to be weak. Increased attention to feminist concerns, however, has awakened the consciousness of such women and stirred the younger women emerging on the scene. Recent studies (by Sherman and her colleagues) support this view and show that women are significantly better informed and more liberal and less stereotyped in their attitudes toward women patients than are their male counterparts. Some of the areas of just plain lack of information on the part of males have to do with female physiological functions, but some of the stereotyped attitudes have to do with such catch-alls as menstrual depression, guilt over child care, and the like. Some men do not know or will not believe that some women are quite happy when their children grow up and leave home. If such a woman seeks to do things she has put off doing, it is attributed to the "empty nest syndrome" for example.

Future lines of research

What areas of research loom ahead. In my view there are two broad areas of research that require attention and each of those cross-cuts other, more specific types of investigations:

1) The entire area called problem-solving must be addressed. We need to know a great deal more about strategies for solving problems, how problems are defined, what are the appropriate criteria for solutions, and what task, personal, or interpersonal variables affect successful problem solving. Obviously, criteria for types of problems and success of solutions must be established independently of stereotypical masculine attributes. No doubt much of the work in androgyny and in achievement motivation will be influential in exploring this area, but direct investigations of closely related phenomena such as leadership styles and how leaders are selected, by whom, and for what sorts of problems must be made. We must examine the approaches of same and mixed-sex groups in choosing tasks and leaders and solutions. Most leadership studies have been and continue to be concerned with males. A great deal remains to be learned about women's behavior in leader positions and the conditions conducive to the attribution of success. It is important to study the performance of women and leadership styles as a function of membership in a male-dominated group or culture as well. (Denmark; Kanter). We have noted that women are set up to be "losers" under present situations. We

need studies of how situational factors help determine effectiveness of different leadership strategies and what are the influences of and consequences for group morale, interpersonal relationships, attribution of success to problem solving behavior, and the like.

2) A second broad area is the need for the exploration of adult development and behavior and thought. The middle-aged woman has been a victim of stereotyped thinking and treatment. Too often most researchers assume the centrality of women's reproductive role and ignore the importance of their work roles. Thus explanations of adult behavior referring to syndromes based on age or reproductive stage, such as menopausal depression and the "empty nest syndrome" receive disproportionate attention. Stage and age theories of personality development deal mainly with male sequences and are inappropriate to the understanding of female development. In some theoretical frameworks it is clearly implied (if not stated) that women cannot achieve resolution of oedipal conflicts or attain an identity apart from marriage and child-rearing, thus condemning women who depart from such choices to neurosis. Probably men and women share certain experiences linked to age -- perhaps a sense of anxiety around the age of 40 that time is running out -- but for women the varying roles she may occupy are not considered. Role patterns and family cycles (e.g., no children, young children, grown children) all have an impact on her experiences. And women at different experiences and construe them and their interpersonal worlds differently.

The very use of terms such as menopausal women or empty nests assumes identical development for all women despite role/stage interactions and betrays fixed ideas about the centrality of thsoe events. Researchers have shown that menopause is neither a central not distressing event and several studies confirm that the well-being of women whose children have left home is higher, and the incidence of depression lower, than women living with young children. When working women are studied, all of them are grouped together indiscriminately, for example, no differentiation is made about the needs, aspirations, or frustrations among sales clerks and female physicians. Calling them all working women reveals the fixed assumptions of centrally important physiological factors and impedes the proper exploration of variables associated with task, role, self-esteem, success, and interpersonal support. A working woman's self-esteem may be more closely related to her success experiences or lack of them than to menstrual depression; As Bernice Neugarten commented "not only is there a paucity of data, but more important, we are without a useful theory."

Conclusion

What can we conclude? By and large women have been left out of investigations and theories of human behavior. Such omissions have led to misapplications of behavioral laws. Even approaches such as social learning theory do not consistently include the study of female behavior, but do provide us with the basis for doing so. Such study should lead

to the demise of androcentric models and to changes in our social systems. It should lead to an inclusion of female behavior in our understanding of human behavior. Certainly, we can expect a change in the assignment of "value" to persons so that no one group of persons gets all the good adjectives on the adjective check list!

The case against sex-difference research as satisfying that need for knowledge about women is three-fold: 1) the basic assumption seems to be that one sex is the norm and the other the deviant -- a condescending if not destructive attitude; 2) the lack of substantial, reliable, valid data supporting alleged sex-differences; 3) the assumption that any difference found is basic in some way rather than revealing merely sex-related differences that may be explained developmentally by reference to socialization, differential treatment, and the like (for example, although men have had higher rates of lung cancer than women, now that more women are smoking cigarettes they too are joining the ranks of lung cancer patients; so the initial difference is not a basic sex difference, but was related to differences in sex due to other variables influencing the behaviors of persons). Sex-difference research, even as it becomes more frequently reported in our journals, is not a sufficient contribution to our understanding of women. Sex-related differences when found, should signal the need for additonal information and require that we study women as well as men in order to explore fully the implications and applications of such knowledge.

The straightforward, unambiguous study of women as women and not merely as reflections of men has attracted a diversity of psychological attention and has led to the emergence of a growing body of information. In short, whether or not one likes the concept "psychology of women" a great deal of research and theorizing is going on under that "umbrella" and the area is beginning to define itself by compelling psychological attention. That is a pragmatic definition if you will, and one that many of us share. Is there a Psychology of Women? It looks like it!

I would like to leave you with Reesa Vaughter's definition of the psychology of women; it is "concerned with the construction of a psychology that is relevant to women, as well as to men; that studies women, as well as men; that employs methodology that is appropriate, meaningful and congruent with the lives of women, as well as men's; that develops theories that predict female, as well as male, behaviors; and that studies questions that are of interest to women, as well as to men. In brief, the goal of the psychology of women is the development of a non-sexist science, a psychology of human behavior."

Reference Notes

Barnett, R.C. and Baruch, G.K. Women in the middle years: A critique of research and theory. Unpublished ms., 1977. (PWQ)

Denmark, F. L. Styles of Leadership. Presidential Address, Division 35, presented at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C., September 1976. In press, Psychology of Women Quarterly

Denmark, F. L. The Psychology of Women. Invited address presented at Eastern Psychological Association, New York City, April 1976.

Mednick, M.T.S. Psychology of women: research issues and trends. Invited address given to New York Academy of Science, May 1976 (to appear in New York Academy of Science Small Annals).

Rose, G.L. Sex effects on effort attribution in managerial performance evaluation. Unpublished ms. (PWQ).

Sandberg, B.R. & White, M.A. The effect of sex-role modeling on occupational interests of children. Unpublished ms. (PWQ).

Sherman, J.A. & Denmark, F.L. (Eds.) The future of women: Issues in Psychology. New York: Psychological Dimensions, Inc., In press.

Stake, J.E., & Levitz, E. Sex differences in achievement-related encouragements and discouragements among high career goal-setters. Unpublished ms. (PWQ).

Tennov, D. Mode of control and reinforcement density as a function of the sex of the behaver (paper delivered at 81st meeting of the American Psychological Association, Montreal, 1973).

Reardon, P. & Prescott, S. Sex as reported in a recent sample of psychological research. In press, Psychology of Women Quarterly.

Vaughter, R.M. Making connections: Psychology of women, 1975. In press, Signs.

References

American Psychological Association. Report of the Task Force on Sex Bias and Sex-role stereotyping in psychotherapeutic practice. American Psychologist, 1975, 30, 1169-1175.

Astin, et al. Women: a bibliography on their education and careers. Washington, D.C.: Human Services Press, 1971.

Astin, et al. Annotated bibliography of sex roles. ADM 75-166, NIMH, USPH, 1974.

Astin, H.S. Women and work. 1976 (in Psychology of women: future directions of research. (See reference)

Baer, H.R. & Sherif, C.W. a topical bibliography (selectively annotated) on the psychology of women. Catalogue of selected documents in psychology, 1974, 4, 42.

Bardwick, J. The psychology of Women. New York: Doubleday, 1970.

Bardwick, J. Psychology of Women: a study of biocultural conflicts. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

Bernard, J. The future of marriage. New York: World Publ., 1972.

Bernard, J. The future of motherhood. New York: Dial Press, 1974.

Bem, S. Beyond androgyny: some presumptions and prescriptions for a liberated sexual identity. 1976 (in Psychology of women: future directions of research. See reference).

Broverman, I.K., et al. Sex-role stereotypes and clinical judgments of mental health. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34, 1-7.

Broverman, I.K., et al. Sex-role stereotypes: a current appraisal. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 59-78.

Carlson, R. Understanding women: implications for personality theory and research. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 17-32.

Carlson, E.R. & Carlson, R. Male and female subjects in personality research. Journal of abnormal and social psychology, 1961, 61, 482-83.

Chesler, P. Women and Madness. New York: Doubleday & Co., 1972.

Dan, A.J. & Beckman, S. Male versus female representation in psycho-

logical research. American Psychologist, 1972, 27, 1078.

Deaux, K. & Emswiller, T. Explanation of successful performance on sex-linked tasks: what is skill for the male is luck for the female. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 29, 80-85.

Denmark, F.L., Tangri, S.S., & McCandless, S. Affiliation, achievement, and power. 1976 (in Psychology of women: future directions of research. See reference).

Denmark, F.L. (coordinating ed.) Women: Volume 1 (APDI reference annual). New York: Psychological Dimensions, Inc. 1976.

Fidell, L.S. Empirical verification of sex discrimination in hiring practices in psychology. American Psychologist, 1970, 25, 1094-98.

Frieze, I.H. Women's expectations for and causal attribution of success and failure (in Women: Social psychological perspectives on achievement; eds., M.T.S. Mednick, S.S. Tangri, & L.W. Hoffman. New York: Holt, Rinehard & Winston, 1975).

Frieze, I.H., Fisher, J., McHugh, M. & Valle, V. Attributing the causes of success and failures: internal and external barriers to achievement in women. 1976. (in Psychology of women: future directions of research. See reference)

Gump, J. Sex role attitudes and psychological well being. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28.

Harris, S.L. Who studies sex differences? American Psychologist, 1972, 27, 1077-78.

Henley, N. Resources for the study of psychology of women. RT: Journal of Radical Therapy, 4 (December 1974): 20-21.

Henley, N. Power, sex and non-verbal communication. Berkeley Journal of Sociology, 1973/74, 18, 1-26.

Henley, N. & Thorne, B. Sex differences in language, speech, and non-verbal communication: an annotated bibliography. (in Language and sex: Differences and Dominance. Ed., B. Thorne & N. Henley. Rowley, Mass.: 1975).

Horney, K. The flight from womanhood: the masculinity complex in women as viewed by men and women. Psychoanalysis and Women. (ed. J.B. Miller0. New York: Penguin Books, 1973.

Huber, J. (ed.) Changing women in a changing society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.

Holmes, D.S. & Jorgenson, B.W. Do personality and social psychologists study men more than women? Representative Research in Social Psychology, 1971, 2, 71-76.

Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 2 (eds., Mednick & Tangri).

Laws, J.L. Work motivation and work behavior in women: new perspectives. 1976. (in Psychology of women: future directions of research; see ref.)

Laws, J.L. The psychology of tokenism: an analysis. Sex Roles, 1975, 1.

Mednick, M.T.S. Some thoughts on the psychology of women: comment on Mary Brown Parlee's Review Essay: Psychology. Signs, 1976, 1, 3.

Mednick, M.T.S., Tangri, S.J. & Hoffman, L.W. Women and achievement: Social and motivational analyses. Washington, D.C.: Hemisphere Publ. Co., 1975.

Mednick, M.T.S. & Weissman, H.J. The psychology of women: selected topics. Annual Review of Psychology, 1975, 26.

Maccoby, E.E., & Jacklin, C.N. The psychology of sex differences. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1974.

Mischel, W. 1966. A social-learning view of sex differences (in Maccoby, ed., The development of sex differences. Stanford University Press.)

O'Leary, V. Occupational barriers to women: a review. Psychological Bulletin, 1973.

Parlee, M.B. Review essay: psychology. Signs, 1975, 1, 1.

Prescott, S. & Foster, K. Why researchers don't study women. In press, Psychology of Women Quarterly.

Psychology of Women Quarterly. In Human Sciences Press Catalog. New York: Behavioral Publications, 1976.

Ruble, D.N., Frieze, I., & Parsons, E. (eds.) Sex-typed behavior: persistence and change. Journal of Social Issues. (special issue) 1976.

Russo, N.F. Beyond adolescence: some suggested new directions for studying female development in the middle and later years. In Psychology of women: future directions in research. See ref. notes.

Schwabacher, S. Male vs. female representation in psychological research: an examination of the Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970-71. JSAS Catalogues of Selected Documents in Psychology, 1972, 2, 70.

Sex Roles: A journal of research. New York: Plenum Press, 1975, 1.

Sherman, J.A. On the psychology of women. Springfield: Chas. C. Thomas, 1971.

Shields, S.A. Functionalism, Darwinism, and the psychology of women: a study in social myth. American Psychologist, 1975, 30, 739-754.

Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 1975, 1.

Spence, J.T. & Helmreich, R. Who likes competent women? competence, sex-role conqruence of interests, and subjects' attitudes toward women as determinants of interpersonal attraction. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 1972, 2.

Stricker, C. Implications of research for psychotherapeutic treatment of women. American Psychologist, 1977, January.

Tennov, D. Psychotherapy: the hazardous cure. New York: Abelard-Shuman, 1975.

Taynor, J. & Deaux, K. When women are more deserving than men: equity, attribution, and perceived sex differences. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 28.

Unger, R.K. & Denmark, F.L. (Eds.) Woman: Dependent or Independent Variable? New York: Psychological Dimensions, Inc., 1975.